



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/583,795	06/21/2006	Kiyotaka Nakano	19672-003US1 RET/PCG-9009	4422
26161	7590	06/26/2009	EXAMINER	
FISH & RICHARDSON PC P.O. BOX 1022 MINNEAPOLIS, MN 55440-1022			BRISTOL, LYNN ANNE	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			1643	
			NOTIFICATION DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			06/26/2009	ELECTRONIC

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

PATDOCTC@fr.com

Examiner-Initiated Interview Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)
	10/583,795	NAKANO ET AL.
	Examiner	Art Unit
	LYNN BRISTOL	1643

All Participants:

Status of Application: _____

(1) LYNN BRISTOL.

(3) _____.

(2) Ryan McQuade.

(4) _____.

Date of Interview: 16 June 2009

Time: 10:30 AM

Type of Interview:

- Telephonic
 Video Conference
 Personal (Copy given to: Applicant Applicant's representative)

Exhibit Shown or Demonstrated: Yes No

If Yes, provide a brief description: .

Part I.

Rejection(s) discussed:

ODP

Claims discussed:

14, 15 and 34

Prior art documents discussed:

10/526,741

Part II.

SUBSTANCE OF INTERVIEW DESCRIBING THE GENERAL NATURE OF WHAT WAS DISCUSSED:

See Continuation Sheet

Part III.

- It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview directly resulted in the allowance of the application. The examiner will provide a written summary of the substance of the interview in the Notice of Allowability.
 It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview did not result in resolution of all issues. A brief summary by the examiner appears in Part II above.

/lynn bristol/
 Temporary Full Signatory Authority

(Applicant/Applicant's Representative Signature – if appropriate)

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was discussed: ODP rejection of Claims 14, 15 and 34: proposed cancelling the claims or arguing criticality of amino acid residues for binding antibodies; Claim 34 does not even identify the claimed peptide. Objections to Claims 3, 6, 7, 14-16, 21, 22, 29, 32, 34, 36-39, 41 and 47: claims fail to identify the antigen molecule for the antibody. Discussed introducing glypcan 3 into a) preamble of Claims 3, 6, and 29 to recite, for example, "an anti-glypcan 3 antibody", or inserting a concluding wherein clause, for example, "wherein the antibody binds glypcan 3., and amending Claim 16 to recite "an aepitope of glypcan 3" in line 1.

To bring claims into condition for allowance, discussed a) cancelling withdrawn, non-elected claims 19, 20, 24-27, 43-46 and 48-53; and b) renumbering claims as 3/1, 6/2, 7/3, 14/4, 15/6, 16/5, 21/7, 22/8, 29/9, 32/10, 34/11, 36/13, 37/14, 38/15, 39/16, 41/17, 47/12. The renumbering of claims after Claim 14 would differ in the event claims 14, 15 and 34 are cancelled..